

1972

Oaxtepec: A Summer Language Camp for Children

Susan Adams

School for International Training

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [First and Second Language Acquisition Commons](#), and the [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Adams, Susan, "Oaxtepec: A Summer Language Camp for Children" (1972). *MA TESOL Collection*. 120.
https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection/120

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Graduate Institute at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in MA TESOL Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

OAXTEPEC;

A SUMMER LANGUAGE CAMP FOR CHILDREN

Susan Adams
Independent Study Project
Master of Arts in Teaching Languages
July, 1972

OAXTEPEC;

A SUMMER LANGUAGE CAMP FOR CHILDREN

CONTENTS

Preface

I. The Site

II. The Classes

III. Interaction Analysis

IV. The Questionnaire

V. The Testing

A. Testing Goals

B. Tests Employed

C. Testing Conditions

D. Background of Campers

E. Test Results

VI. Conclusions

Appendix A: Sample Questionnaire

Appendix B: Teacher-Performance Rating Sheet

Appendix C: Interaction Analysis Categories

References

PREFACE

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

My purpose in Oaxtepec was three-fold. First was the testing for which the Modern Language Association Tests forms L and M were used. This included three testing sessions, a pre-test given on July 7, 1971, to seventy-two campers. This session included giving the Modern Language Aptitude Test to those campers with no previous Spanish training. Their aptitude scores were compared to their achievement scores at the end of the camp and after the homestays to see if any correlation could be made between aptitude and achievement. These results are discussed in the section "The Beginners." The mid-test was given on July 31, at the end of the Language Camp and the final test was given on August 23, after their three-week homestays. These two tests made it possible to check how much Spanish was learned during the Language Camp as compared with during the homestay. I did all the scoring except for the oral section which was done for all three tests by one of the language teachers. After each test the mean and standard deviation were computed, after the second and third test the standard of error and the confidence level were added to the statistical results.

Second was to deal with the classes themselves which included both teachers and students. The method used for determining the interaction between teacher and students was Gertrude Moskowitz's scale for interaction analysis (see Appendix B). For students who are learning a foreign language it is, of course, important that interaction is taking place and that they do more of the speaking. It was my hypothesis that as classes continued the student-talk would increase steadily and substantially.

This point is discussed in the section on "Interaction Analysis."

Before observing in the classes I met with all the teachers and the language coordinator of the camp to explain the function of interaction analysis, the checklist for rating teacher-performance (See Appendix C), and the purpose for my being at the Language Camp. The teachers were not to feel threatened by my presence in the classroom or that my report would affect their jobs-I was there strictly to do a research project. All were interested in the method and results of the interaction analysis and cooperated in every way possible. During the third week a questionnaire was distributed to all campers in order to get their candid reactions to the classes and suggestions they might have as to changes that would improve their language fluency. (See Appendix A)

Third was to teach English as a Second Language to one fifteen year old Mexican boy. As before my arrival in Mexico, no one knew that he would be at the camp, It was my job to find, and invent what materials I could. We had classes for three hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon. His sixth hour of class was spent with one of the leaders who had some previous experience teaching English. This arrangement was necessary so that observations in the Spanish classes could continue with one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon. The rest of this report will deal only with the Spanish section of the Language Camp as that was the original proposal and teaching English as a Second Language was added upon my arrival in Oaxtepec.

I. The Site

Oaxtepec is a vacation center that is located two hours southeast of Mexico City. It was built by the Social Security of Mexico so that even those less privileged persons of this country could enjoy vacations. Oaxtepec covers some one hundred acres and included on the grounds are four dormitory buildings, cafeteria, hotel, auditorium, cabins, administration building, supermarket, clinic, basketball courts, football stadium, botanical gardens picnic areas, and thirteen swimming pools. The center is open twelve months a year and is especially popular on the weekends. During the week there are often conventions and groups meeting at Oaxtepec.

As a site for the Experiment's Summer Language Camp it serves well in that the campers are constantly in contact with Mexicans. At the same time this works against their language learning as there are continuous distractions and the over-crowded conditions on the weekend adds to this problem.

The entire language camp had its operations in one dormitory. Six of the women teachers and leaders were located in rooms on the first floor while the rest of the staff and campers were located on the second floor in dormitory rooms. The office and teacher's room were also on the second floor. Classes were conducted in various areas on this upper level of Oaxtepec. Four classes met in rooms of the tower; when these were not available due to conventions they met in four rooms on the first floor of the dormitory. Two classes met in rooms of the administration building and three classes met in rooms located in small buildings near the administration building. There were seven teachers therefore seven classes. All classrooms were not constantly occupied but each class met in a different room in the morning and afternoon and all the classrooms were not

always at our disposal. The main difficulty with the classrooms were the acoustics. Their high ceilings, cement walls, and tile floors tended to distort sounds greatly. Many of the rooms also lacked suitable desk chairs for use in a classroom.

It must also be understood that being in Mexico is not like being in the United States. Mexicans are generally not as organized or as punctual as Americans and this holds especially true in Oaxtepec. One must decipher the administration-hierarchy and go through the proper channels to get things accomplished. The word decipher is especially important because nowhere can be found a list of "who's-who" in Oaxtepec. Simple things like getting towels and soap can be a long, drawn-out affair when the "engargado" (boy in charge of the main desk in the dorms) decides he does not feel like going over to the store-room to get them. Classrooms in the tower were also a problem because sometimes the workers were "too tired" to put the dividers back in so that instead of one large conference room there were four or five classrooms. Due to the fact that the Experiment has used Oaxtepec for several years there were fewer of these problems but it still remains a slow process of being nice to the right people at the right time to get things done.

II. The Classes

I began observing in the classes on June 14, 1971, after giving the teachers an opportunity to get settled and be more at ease with their classes. This also gave me the opportunity to speak with the teachers as a group in order to explain my project and the reason for my being in the classrooms. I was pleased at their interest and also the interest of many of the leaders. All of the teachers took an active interest in the interaction-analysis method and were especially pleased when they improved

in an area they wanted to change. (ie: more student-talk). The seven teachers were a varied group too, some with experience and some with none. In age they ranged from twenty-one years old to twenty-five years. Four were beginners in teaching Spanish but one had taught at the National University in Mexico City and another taught Mexican History at the Universidad Ibero-Americana. For the other three, it was their second or third time to teach Spanish for the Experiment. In recommendations to Alvino Fantini (director of the camp) there were three whose qualifications should be seriously considered before they are re-hired. One had taught previously at the Language Camp but was much too formal and strict in the classroom for this age group and the informal structure of the camp. Outside the classroom his personality reversed itself but inside there was definitely a stifling atmosphere. The other two were both new at teaching Spanish, but teachers of other subjects during the winter. One thought there was no more room for improvement- a real ego problem. The other just had no "oomph" to classes; they were just blah and dragged. These, of course, were technical problems not always detected by the students and the rapport between the students and teachers both in and out of the classroom was very good. As can be seen from the results of my questionnaire to the campers (See Appendix A), there were no complaints about any of the teachers. The biggest surprise to the directors was one of the new teachers who performed highly. This teacher had been at The School for International Training for two English programs two years previously and had an excellent understanding of both the Experiment in International Living Method and the micro-wave technique developed by Ray Clark. In training sessions both before starting classes and during the camp, the teachers were exposed to other methods and books and given suggestions on how to adapt these materials

to their classes. How much adaptation was done, of course, was up to the individual and some did more than others. The point is that the opportunity was there. The biggest problem came under the heading of preparation. The Mexican teachers with their "mañana" attitude sometimes put this aspect of teaching out of the picture and their classes showed it. One of the teachers who had problems with the second group learned that preparation was invaluable. Subsequently his classes improved noticeably. After observing these classes and teachers for three weeks, it is my conclusion that teachers whether so-trained or not can be good language teachers with constant help and suggestions such as they had from Beatriz Fantini, the Language Coordinator. They are native-speakers of the language they were teaching, but teaching rather than conversing is a whole different bag of tricks. In subsequent training programs I suggest even more instruction on teaching grammatical points. Even if the method used is audio-lingual, students ask questions and they have the right to expect clear and concise explanations which native-speakers often do not have because they never studied their language in reference to teaching it to English speakers.

III. Interaction Analysis

The Interaction Analysis system was developed by Ned A. Flanders and adapted by Gertrude Molkowitz for the foreign language classroom.¹ The system includes ten categories that are divided into three parts. (See Appendix B) The first seven indicate teacher behavior, either direct or indirect influence on the students. Indirect influence is that which encourages the student to participate and direct influence that which limits student participation such as lecturing or criticism. The next two

¹Gertrude Moskowitz, The Foreign Language Teacher Interacts.

categories describe student behavior, either limited or unlimited participation. The last category is that of silence or confusion in the classroom. In applying this system it is essential to record the climate in the classroom and therefore behavior is recorded according to the students perceptions rather than the teacher's intentions.² In reference to the audio-lingual method (one used mainly in Oaxtepec), Miss Moskowitz says:

Some foreign language teachers report that students seem bored or restless after receiving audio-lingual instruction in a language for a period of time. In analyzing their interaction, these teachers have found that they tend to restrict themselves to a very limited number of behavior patterns, which in itself can induce boredom through monotony. In such cases, if they wish, teachers can be experimental and try to increase the range of behaviors by using additional behaviors that could enhance the lesson, while not interfering with the structural aspects. Behaviors from Categories 1,2, and 3 (accepts student feelings, praises or jokes, and accepts student ideas) can be injected into drill-type lessons to add the human element to the lesson.

In reviewing the matrices of the teachers at the camp, this same comment is applicable. The percentage of one's, two's, and three's is very low compared to the time spent in drills (the 6-8 pattern), lecturing, and question and answer periods (the 4-8 or 4-9). These were the most frequent patterns throughout the three weeks. The lack of indirect influence was the most common pattern for all the teachers. At the end of the three weeks, all but three of the teachers had the students speaking the same amount or more than they were.

One of these teachers is an interesting case. The first time I observed this class it was well-planned and conducted. There was a lot

²Ibid., p. 4.

³Ibid., p. 81.

of indirect influence to encourage student participation, the percentage of student-talk was greater than that of teacher-talk, and the most common pattern was extended student-talk. This teacher is also the one who has taught before and has an ego problem. Perhaps after discussing this class he decided no more work was necessary. This was obvious in the following observations where the percentage of teacher talk increased to sometimes more than double that of student-talk. In general, there was a definite lack of preparation shown in these classes.

These observations are all interesting and some general conclusions such as those mentioned above can be extrapolated. These observations were based on the Interaction Analysis Method and also on Teacher-Performance Rating Sheets(See Appendix C). The students were also given an opportunity to express their opinions in a questionnaire, which will be discussed in the following section. In considering the Interaction Analysis Method it must be remembered that it is a system of looking at teaching and not one of evaluation. It shows the interaction that takes place between the teacher and students. "The system does not tell teachers how to teach or that there is only one approach to teaching. It only shows what they are doing as they teach. Perhaps the best way to express this is:

INTERACTION IS NOT A WAY OF TEACHING IT IS A WAY OF LOOKING AT TEACHING."⁴

IV. The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was distributed during the last week of the camp so that they had the opportunity to get used to the third and last change in teachers. Rather than include all the questionnaires they were tallied onto one. Even though they were given to the leaders to be filled out

⁴Ibid., p. 85.

during orientation, there were about five that never found their way back to me. There were also a few who did not care enough to complete all the questions, but aside from these few, they were all serious and honest in their comments and answers. The following results were obtained from the second administering of the questionnaire. Results of the first questionnaire are not available at this time. The results show that the majority of the campers knew exactly the situation they would encounter at the Language Camp in Oaxtepec. In regard to the number of hours spent in class, 45% believed that it was the right amount. The break-down of the questionnaire follows:

1. When I entered this program I thought the first three weeks would be:

"camp-like"	<u>19</u>	(29% of total)
not as serious	<u>12</u>	(18%)
just as it was	<u>25</u>	(38%)
more intensive	<u>9</u>	(13%)

2. I entered the language program with:

high expectations	<u>50</u>	(76%)
moderate enthusiasm	<u>12</u>	(18%)
little enthusiasm	<u>2</u>	(3%)
only because it was required by EIL	<u>1</u>	(1%)
under influence of others who thought it a good idea	<u>1</u>	(1%)

3. Before entering the program I felt that the total progress we would make in three weeks would be:

equivalent to six or eight weeks of language study in school	<u>6</u>	(9%)
equivalent to a semester or more	<u>28</u>	(42%)
adequate to enable me to converse in a limited way with my host family and others in Mexico	<u>30</u>	(45%)

4. Now that I have completed the course, I feel that the progress I made was:

equivalent to six or eight weeks of language study in a school	<u>8</u>	(12%)
equivalent to a semester	<u>9</u>	(13%)
sufficient to give me a vocabulary of one or two hundred words	<u>4</u>	(6%)
equivalent to more than a semester	<u>18</u>	(26%)
adequate to enable me to converse in a limited way with my host family and others in Mexico	<u>25</u>	(38%)

5. In terms of total number of hours spent in formal language study, I believe that the amount of time was:

too little, we could have spent more time without suffering	<u>6</u>	(9%)
about the right amount	<u>45</u>	(68%)

too much, we simply could not
absorb all we were given

15 (22%)

6. In terms of the demands which the language made upon me, I felt that:

other important aspects of Experiment
orientation were slighted

17 (26%)

they did not seriously interfere
with the orientation process

35 (53%)

Orientation and language classes
should not run at the same time
(State how they should be divided)

4 (6%)

7. I feel that the three week language course was:

extremely valuable to me (in preparation
for my homestay or in my homestay)

41 (62%)

a help, but not necessary

22 (33%)

unnecessary as I would learn the
language anyway

0 (--)

of no help

3 (4%)

8. My homestay family spoke:

no English

30 (45%)

some English

28 (42%)

Fluent English

8 (12%)

9. Are you continuing the study of Spanish next fall?

yes

60 (90%)

no

3 (5%)

10. Are you being given any academic credit for your study this summer?

yes

20 (30%)

no

15 (22%)

11. In making my own evaluation of this program I believe that the
Experiment should: (check as many as are appropriate)

shorten the program to two weeks

25 (38%)

lengthen the program for a four week
duration

5 (8%)

maintain the program for a three weeks
duration.

29 (33%)

add weekend homestays (Cuernavaca or Cuautla)	<u>19</u>	(29%)
drop the program completely	<u>0</u>	(--)
engage more qualified teachers	<u>1</u>	(1%)
require us to speak nothing but Spanish at all times	<u>9</u>	(13%)
have more correlated cultural activities to supplement language instruction (song fests, films, etc.)	<u>33</u>	(50%)
keep us in our own Experiment groups rather than placing us into different level ability groupings	<u>5</u>	(8%)
place us into level ability groupings rather than be Experiment groups	<u>12</u>	(18%)

It was interesting to note that 50% thought there should be more correlated cultural activities but often they did not participate in the ones offered. Each weekend there was an excursion in which everyone participated but other activities were not as popular. The folk dancing every night was supported by the teachers and leaders and a few campers. Also, the night songs were taught, enthusiasm was at a low ebb. The arts and crafts classes were popular but not with the majority. In short, it is easy to say they want something and a different story when you try to get them to participate.

V. The Testing

A. Testing Goals

The testing goals were:

1. How much language progress occurs during the total program?
2. When does more language progress occur-during the Camp with intensive instruction in Spanish, or during the homestay?
3. What is the final achievement of the individual students?

The directors, on the other hand, were interested in some other goals also. The goals of the Pre-test and ensuing tests were:

4. What do the campers already know in the Spanish language when they arrive?
5. How should the campers be grouped so as to provide homogeneous classes for more rapid learning?
6. How much progress was made through their efforts in the classes?
7. How well did the campers master the materials presented to them?

B. Tests Employed

1. Aptitude-Carrol_Sapon Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT)
2. Achievement-MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests
3. Progress-Classroom quizzes
4. Questionnaire-(See sample in Appendix A)

The MLAT was of questionable value. The background of the students and their language experiences as well as the teacher's observations in the first few classes proved much more reliable. The sampling of only eleven beginners who took the MLAT was ridiculously small to seek any correlation between aptitude and achievement. It is true that aptitude tests were first developed to predict which students would be successful in learning a foreign tongue but Carroll, states that this is not only an oversimplification, but downright wrong:

Language learning is a complex task and success is governed not merely by aptitude but by a variety of factors. There are a number of factors present in second language learning: age, IQ and background, previous language learning experience, motivation, other characteristics of the learner (memory, ear-mindedness, type of command sought, instructional conditions, teacher and materials.⁵

Another aspect which Carroll himself points out is that the validity coefficients of the MLAT test were high (.84) when used to predict success in Army courses, but their predictive validity was lower when used with high school groups. This was due to the fact that Army groups are carefully selected whereas high school groups are less homogeneous containing more variables in motivation, intelligence, etc.⁶ The Language Camp participants more closely resemble the high school population and consequently it should be expected that the MLAT would be a less reliable predictor of success. As it turned out, the MLAT test scores had little effect on students' achievement as will be seen later.

C. Testing Conditions

The first testing was conducted at the Colegio de Mexico on July 7, 1971. As the laboratory can accommodate only twenty people at a time it

⁵Rebecca Valette, Modern Language Testing, pp. 9.

⁶Ibid., p. 10.

was a complicated affair to test seventy-two in the space of four hours when the test itself takes four hours. This meant that while one group was in the lab the others were taking one or two parts that do not require the use of the lab in other classrooms.

There were problems with this testing because the original tape was not sent down but instead a copy. This copy did not have the sections timed and we did not realize this until the next section was begun about ten minutes too soon. The mistake was immediately corrected but the confusion did upset those being tested. During this first hour of testing there was also a lot of outside noise that even closed windows did not completely eliminate. For this test and all subsequent tests there was musical interference on the tapes. The man in charge of the laboratory said this was due to a near-by radio station whose signals often interfered. This is one explanation but it might also be due to the fact that the original tapes had music in the background. The individual tapes that are sent should be clean and de-magnetized. Some of the tapes did not record but a previous testing could be heard or both voices came through making the scoring very difficult. Before the second testing on July 31, 1971, we de-magnetized all the tapes but this did not eliminate the problem.

Due to a misunderstanding with the leaders, there was one section of the test that had to be given in Oaxtepec. This was the Writing Section and it presented no great problem. There were also four girls who missed the Listening portion of the test. They were tested on July 9, in Oaxtepec. The rooms in Oaxtepec are in no way perfect test situations. The high ceilings and tile floors make the acoustics especially bad and any outside noises are greatly amplified. Therefore, these four girls did not have the best situation in which to be tested.

The second testing on July 31, 1971, had fewer problems and complications. The music was still present and louder in some booths than in others. One boy was given the writing and reading sections at the Colegio as he had been sick the day before when we administered those sections in Oaxtepec. His scores did not improve tremendously and his illness may have had something to do with that. There were also several who took the test although not feeling well.

D. Background of the Campers

The Beginners

The statistical computations for this group included only ten of the eleven who were given the MLAT. Celeste C. de Baca, although she did not have any formal instruction in Spanish, spoke it in her home. Celeste did quite well on the MLAT (95%ile) and her aptitude for language showed in her high achievement in Spanish. On the LB test she scored in the (99%ile) in all sections except Writing. This is not unusual as writing is the least stressed aspect of language learning with the audio-lingual method. Julie Gilmour is another special case although she is included with the beginners as she had no previous training in Spanish. Julie's aptitude for language learning is very high (99%ile) and her background in language is extensive. She has had seven years of Latin and four years of French. Her knowledge of these two languages helped significantly with her acquisition of Spanish. As a result, she scored in the 99%ile in all sections of the LB test. Diane Vineyard and Robert Funkhouser both scored high on the MLAT but their scores on the LB were not outstanding. John Yerkes and Glenda Birkhead scored very low on the MLAT and their scores on the LB were also low. Even so, as suggested earlier it is impossible to suggest a cut-off score on the MLAT. There were also several who scored very high on the MLAT but whose achievement scores were low.

The Intermediate and Advanced Groups

These two groups had both high and low scoring campers. There were, as always happens, those who were really motivated to learn Spanish and those who did the bare minimum. Some felt they already knew all they needed and projected that attitude. Most of these were in the advanced groups and it is interesting to note that the mean for this group's speaking ability dropped two points instead of improving after the third testing. I believe that this is also the reason that after computing the statistics for the Speaking Section on the M form the result is that the scores were invalid. By invalid it is meant that there can be no confidence that these scores have any significant meaning and are not due to chance. The confidence level for the Speaking Section on the L form was just barely valid. This can also be due to the fact that the scoring of the speaking is rather subjective. There is a form to follow and the same teacher scored all tests, but even so, it involves a subjective element.

A Recapitulation

A summary of the problems encountered in actual administration of the test at the Colegio were the following:

1. Musical interference picked up on the tapes in the lab from a nearby radio station.
2. Student attitudes toward the testing situation were not favorable. They resented tests which they did not anticipate as part of the Camp Program.
3. In some cases, the M and L levels were given at the same time in the same lab. Since the timing was different for each of the tests, there was interference. Some students spoke while others were listening and vice-versa.
4. Sickness was a real consideration since some students suffered from stomach upsets and other ailments during the tests. Others were exhausted after a long train trip or a "fiesta" party the night before. Testing began at 8:30 A.M.

5. Several mechanical failures occurred producing blank tapes. When failures were discovered after the first test, 3 campers were later re-tested at Oaxtepec using conventional tape recorders. Their scores were affected both by the difference in the testing machinery and their exposure to the same test twice.
6. Some of the tapes were old, unclear, or had background noise from improper erasing.
7. Background noise was a further distraction coming from the open windows and noisy rooms below. It was impossible to eliminate this entirely even by closing all of the windows (which then made the room somewhat uncomfortable).

As already stated, the total number of 72 Campers was divided into three sections for testing purposes:

Beginners	11
Intermediate	40
Advanced	21

The background of these individuals varied considerably. In age, the students ranged from 13 to 16. Geographically they came from over twenty states of the United States; from both public and private high schools; some with labs and many without. Some had been exposed to audio-lingual language training; others to a traditional method, and still others had been taught with a combination of methods. Likewise they had studied with some twelve different text books. Of the eleven beginners, ten had no previous study or contact with Spanish; one, however, came from a Spanish-speaking home. Although she never studied the language formally obviously she could not be considered statistically with the other beginners. Forty Campers had from one year to two years of study. And finally there were twenty-one Campers with over two years of study which meant anywhere from three to seven years. In each of these groups, some of the participants had studied or been exposed to other languages; few had not. These other languages included Chinese, German, French, Hebrew, and Latin; the study

of these languages ranged from one year to as many as seven. Some of the teenagers had also traveled or studied abroad; one spent a year in France, another one year in Israel and another had lived for two years in Indonesia. All in all, the group was quite sophisticated in terms of language exposure. And of course, the greater the variety in backgrounds, the more difficult to make significant statistical comments for those who took the MLAT, or for the entire group which took the achievement tests. The following list suggest the great variety of language background of the Campers:

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND OF CAMPERS

<u>Name</u>	<u>Language, Years of Study, Method</u>	<u>Test</u>
Beer, Rebecca	Spanish, 1year, traditional	LA
Blumberg, Emily	Spanish, 3 years, combination AL & Traditional French, 1 year, AL Hebrew, 1 year, traditional	MA
Buk, Susan	Spanish, 3 years, AL & Traditional	MA
Calhoun, Mari	French, 7 years, Traditional Spanish, 1 year, AL & Traditional	LA
Calhoun, Peter	Spanish, 1 year, AL & Traditional Latin, 2 years, Traditional	LA
Campbell, Cuncan	Spanish, 4 years, AL & Traditional	MA
Cole, Liz	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional French, 1 year, Traditional	LA
De Baca, Celeste	Beginner, speaks some Spanish at home	MLAT
Egger, Nancy	Spanish, 1 year, AL & Traditional	LA
Freeman, David	Spanish, 1 year, AL & Traditional	LA
Gilmour, Julie	Latin, 2 years, traditional French 7 years plus 1 year in France No Spanish	MLAT
Gelman, Marc,	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional	LA
Golombek, Steven	Spanish 3 years, AL & Traditional	MA
Guggenheim, Nancy	Hebrew, 3 years, traditional Spanish, 1 year, AL French, 1 year, AL	LA
Hartigan, Patricia	Spanish, 1 year, AL & Traditional	LA
Hazelrigg, Lynn	Spanish 7 years, Traditional	MA
Heidell, Pam	Spanish, 3 years, AL & Traditional Latin, 2 years, Traditional	MA
Hertzberg, Amy	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional	LA
Irons, Cheryl	Spanish 1 year, AL	LA

Jacobs, Debbie	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional Hebrew, 3 years, Traditional	LA
Jacobson, Janet	Spanish 3 years, AL & Traditional	MA
Kahn, Carol	French, 7 years, home, travel, tutoring Spanish, 2 years, AL & Traditional	MA
Karo, Ronald	Spanish, 2 years, Traditional	LA
Kellner, Charles	Spanish, 2 years, AL & Traditional	LA
Kraus, Kenneth	Spanish, 4 years, AL	MA
Kropf, Julie	Spanish, 1 year Hebrew-lived in Israel 1 year	LA
Krumboltz, Ann	Spanish, 1 year, AL & Traditional	LA
Lowell, Harriet	Spanish, 4 years, AL (speak some Spanish in home) Latin, 2 years	MA
Mace, Anthony	Spanish, 2 years, Traditional	LA
Margolis, Susan	Spanish, 2 years, AL & Traditional Hebrew, 4 years, AL Yiddish, 6 months, AL	LA
Marks, Elizabeth	Spanish, 2 years, AL	LA
Pachner, Joan	Spanish, 4 years, AL & Traditional	MA
Parsons, Jessica	Spanish, 3 years, Traditional German, 1 year, Traditional	MA
Perahia, Ellen	Spanish, 2 years, AL & Traditional	LA
Pesin, Ella	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional Hebrew, 3 years, Traditional	LA
Philips, Mark	Spanish, 4 years, AL & Traditional	MA
Reusch, Germaine	German, 1 year, AL Spanish, 6 years, AL	MA
Rosencranz, Jim	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional	LA
Royce, Sabrina	Spanish, 2 years, Traditional	LA
Salazar, Gary	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional	LA
Simel, Gary	Spanish, 1 year, AL & Traditional	LA
Slugg, Elizabeth	Spanish, 3 years, AL & Traditional	MA

Spriggs, Julie	French, 7 years, AL & Traditional Latin, 1 year, Traditional Spanish 1 year, AL & Traditional	LA
Stich, Margaret	Spanish, 2 years, AL & Traditional	LA
Todd, Mitsy	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional French, 2 years Indonesian (lived there for 2 years)	LA
Walters, Ingre	Spanish 2 years, Traditional	LA
Weiner, William	Spanish, 1 year, Traditional	LA
Weitz, Rona	Spanish, 3 years Yiddish, 4 years (3 hours/week) Hebrew, 2 years	MA
Young, Bonnie	French, 3 years, Traditional Hebrew 6 months, Traditional Spanish, 2 years, AL Chinese, 6 months, AL & Traditional	LA

⁷ Fantini, Alvino, Oaxtepec: A summer Language Camp for Children (Description and Evaluation), 1971, pp. 15-19.

E. The Test Results

Although tests were administered three times to each of the Campers, individual student scores are not available for incorporation in this report. Unfortunately, scores from the pre-test and mid-test were mailed to The Experiment without retaining copies and as of this date, the scores have not arrived. Therefore, only individual scores from the final test are presented in this paper, plus group averages from the beginning and final tests. This will at least permit group comparisons at two different points in time. Following are individual test scores for each of the Campers for each of the phases of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Scores are grouped by beginning, intermediate and advanced levels:

TEST 3 Post-Test August 24, 1971

MLA Spanish Tests
Form LA

BEGINNERS

	LISTENING			SPEAKING			READING			WRITING		
	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%
Berman, D..	26	160	91	45	172	99	22	152	87	11	138	29
Birkhead, G.	20	152	91	29	152	74	9	138	11	6	136	18
Bowden, D.	21	154	82	33	158	88	14	144	47	3	136	18
Brooks, P.	19	150	73	41	166	99	11	140	22	31	146	63
Collins, S.	21	154	82	41	166	99	16	146	66	17	142	46
De Baca, C.*	41	178	99.9	71	202	99.9	41	174	99.6	71	164	96
Funkhouser, R.	31	166	96	44	170	99	18	148	76	11	138	29
Gilgour, J.	43	180	99.8	75	206	99.9	48	182	99.9	96	174	99.9
Vineyard, D.	21	154	82	37	162	99	13	142	37	37	150	72
Williams, K.	24	158	88	30	154	81	5	132	3	7	138	29
Yerkes, J.	11	140	22	17	138	15	18	148	76	3	136	18

*Spanish spoken at home, not included in group average.

TEST 3
Post-Test
August 24, 1971

MLA Spanish Tests
Form La

INTERMEDIATES

	LISTENING			SPEAKING			READING			WRITING		
	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%
Amron, A.	43	180	99.8	64	194	99.9	38	170	99.2	90	172	99.9
Beer, R.	29	164	95	57	186	99.9	25	156	94	36	150	72
Calhoun, P.	25	158	88	55	184	99.9	22	152	87	39	150	72
Calhoun, T.	33	168	97	47	174	99.9	14	144	47	9	138	29
Calhoun, M.	32	166	96	51	178	99.9	24	154	91	59	158	88
Cameron, K.	38	174	99.1	60	188	99.9	40	174	99.6	82	168	99.9
Cole, E.	21	154	82	52	180	99.9	20	150	83	37	150	72
Egger, N.	39	176	99.7	60	188	99.9	42	176	99.8	96	174	99.9
Freeman, D.	32	166	96	59	188	99.9	20	150	83	47	154	81
Gelman, K.	24	158	88	40	166	99	16	146	66	30	146	63
Goldstein, I.B.	41	178	99.8	65	194	99.9	46	180	99.9	95	174	99.9
Guggenheim, N.	25	158	88	56	184	99.9	21	152	87	52	156	85
Hartigan, P.	36	172	99	64	194	99.9	43	176	99.8	94	172	99.9
Hertzberg, A.	32	166	96	59	188	99.9	32	164	98	65	160	90
Irons, C.	35	70	98	63	192	99.9	27	158	94	83	168	99.9
Jacobs, D.	41	178	99.8	75	206	99.9	42	176	99.8	87	170	99.9
Kahn, C.	47	180	99.8	75	206	99.9	46	180	99.9	100	176	99.9
Karo, R.	34	170	98	41	166	99	18	148	76	53	156	85
Kellner, C.	38	174	99.1	70	200	99.9	41	174	99.6	87	170	99.9
Kirshner, S.	24	158	88	46	172	99	25	156	94	85	168	99.9
Kropf, J.	41	178	99.8	68	198	99.9	37	170	99.7	85	168	99.9
Krumboltz, A.	26	160	91	51	178	99.9	15	144	47	42	152	76

INTERMEDIATES (Cont'd.)

	LISTENING			SPEAKING			READING			WRITING		
	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%
Mace, A.	42	180	99.8	61	190	99.9	42	176	99.8	96	174	99.9
Margolis, S.	28	162	94	40	166	99	19	148	76	44	152	76
Marks, E.	37	174	99.1	57	186	99.9	31	162	98	75	164	96
Pearson, E.	31	166	96	58	186	99.9	31	162	98	87	170	99.9
Pearahia, E.	24	158	88	41	166	99	22	152	87	18	147	46
Porter, E.	40	176	99.7	(Laryngitis)			38	170	99.2	89	170	99.9
Rosencranz, J.	35	170	98	51	178	99.9	22	152	87	37	150	72
Royce, S.	35	170	98	44	170	99	18	148	76	32	148	67
Salazar, G.	36	172	99	58	186	99.9	28	160	97	86	170	99.9
Simel, G.	26	160	91	45	172	99	21	152	87	21	142	46
Smith, S.	33	168	97	63	192	99.9	27	158	94	65	160	90
Spriggs, J.	39	176	99.7	65	194	99.9	42	176	99.8	95	174	99.9
Stich, M.	20	152	76	43	170	99	12	140	22	31	146	63
Todd, M.	26	160	91	59	188	99.9	19	148	76	80	166	98
Walters, I.	31	166	96	(Laryngitis)			36	168	99	87	170	99.9
Weiner, W.	33	168	97	47	174	99.9	31	162	98	66	162	93
Young, B.	43	180	99.8	71	202	99.9	44	178	99.9	95	174	99.9
Young, L.	27	160	91	63	192	99.9	27	158	94	64	160	90

TEST 3
Post-Test
August 24, 1971

MLA Spanish Tests
Form MA

ADVANCED

	LISTENING			SPEAKING			READING			WRITING		
	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%	Raw	Conv.	%
Blumberg, E.	35	186	99.4	68	204	99.9	28	178	87	77	176	99.4
Brinkerhoff, A.	27	176	86	55	188	99.9	19	166	65	45	162	66
Burk, S.	29	178	93	64	198	99.9	11	150	24	75	174	98
Campbell, D.	20	166	62	63	198	99.9	19	166	65	69	172	96
Golombek, S.	34	184	98	69	204	99.9	30	180	90	91	180	99.9
Hazelrigg, L.	19	164	58	69	204	99.9	19	166	65	71	176	99.4
Heidell, P.	30	180	94	68	204	99.9	33	184	94	78	176	99.4
Jacobson, J.	36	186	99.4	71	208	99.9	33	172	78	90	180	99.9
Kraus, K.	31	180	94	74	210	99.9	22	172	78	75	174	98
Lowell, H.	36	186	99.4	73	210	99.9	29	180	90	71	174	98
Pachner, J.	28	176	86	62	196	99.9	19	166	65	69	172	96
Parsons, J.	20	166	62	70	206	99.9	16	162	56	38	158	52
Philips, M.	34	184	98	69	204	99.9	24	172	78	83	178	99.9
Reusch, G.	36	186	99.4	70	206	99.9	24	172	78	71	174	98
Setchko, J.	21	166	62	57	190	99.9	16	162	56	56	166	82
Sherman, S.	28	176	86	60	194	99.9	24	172	78	40	158	52
Slugg, E.	27	176	86	68	204	99.9	17	164	60	62	170	90
Stein, J.	17	160	49	44	176	84	8	146	10	36	156	45
Towers, P.	26	174	84	(Laryngitis)			9	148	16	50	164	71
Weitz, R.	36	186	99.4	75	212	99.9	33	184	94	91	180	99.9

Comparison of Group Averages on Pre- and Post-Test

Group I-Beginners

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Mean ₁	Mean ₂	*Conv. -Score	%1	%2	SD ₁	SD ₂
Listening	145	157	+12	45%	87%	17.2	10.5
Speaking	146.67	164.5	+17	38%	99%	18.55	17.5
Reading	147.5	150	+ 2.5	71%	83%	10.6	12.8
Writing	141.5	143	+ 1.5	42%	46%	11.9	10.75

Group II-Intermediates (2 years or less)

Listening	154.15	167.15	+13	62%	88%	10.65	8.15
Speaking	166.45	184.5	+18	89%	99%	13.85	11.05
Reading	150	160.65	+10	48%	77%	10.7	11.95
Writing	150.75	161.35	+11	42%	72%	10.75	10.50

Group III-Advanced (over 2 years)

Listening	160.8	177.25	+17	49%	88%	12.3	8.25
Speaking	179.9	201.4	+21	90%	99%	14.05	7.3
Reading	156	168.25	+12	38%	69%	8.3	10.5
Writing	156.05	171	+15	45%	90%	8.2	8.0

The above chart represents group scores from the pre-and post-tests.⁸ These were computed by averaging the converted scores for all of the members of each group. The mid-test scores (for intermediate and advanced groups) were not available and are not included. Converted scores are used for this purpose because these relate the A forms of the L and M level tests to the alternate version, or the B form. This permits a valid comparison of scores from the A and B forms to determine what progress has been made.

The group averages represent the mean score for each of the three groups (beginners, intermediates and advanced); these are compared in the columns Mean₁ and Mean₂. The mean, of course, is only one of the statistics used to represent a center point in a whole distribution of scores.

Column₃ indicates the differential between mean scores obtained by the group in the pre- and post-tests in each of the aspects of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. With the exception of reading and writing scores for the beginners, all mean scores reflect a differential increase of from 10 to 21 points. One reason may explain the negligible differential in beginners' scores for reading and writing. Neither discipline was taught as part of the beginning course; the emphasis was entirely on listening and speaking aspects, whereas intermediates and advanced students had background in these disciplines and obviously improved in reading and writing throughout the summer even without additional instruction.

It is also interesting to note that in all cases for all three groups, greater progress was made in the listening-speaking phases than for the reading-writing phases (from a low of 12 to a high of 21 for listening-speaking

⁸The pre-test for beginners is actually Test No. 2 since they were not given the MLA prior to the Camp but rather the MLAT.

and from a low of 10 to a high of 15 for reading-writing, excluding the aberrant scores from the beginning group). This statistic also reflects what one would expect from a group in which the emphasis was purely on the oral dimension of the language.

Conversion of the mean converted scores into percentile figures provides another way of looking at progress of the group in their relation to the progress made by groups studying in high schools. The conversion of converted scores into percentile scores reflects a greater distinction between the pre-and post-test scores. It also gives us some indication as to what one might expect in the performance of groups at various points in time.⁹

Columns 6 and 7 show the standard deviation for each of the four sections of the test as computed for the three groups on the mid-test and post-test. This statistical computation refers to the number of points either up or down that the scores vary from the mean or center point in the range of scores.

VI. Conclusions

Test results are an important part of any program as they show the progress that is made by the individuals. This in turn reflects the quality of the program itself. The sampling for each test, the MLAT and M form of the MLA tests in particular for this year, was so small that the scores can have almost no significance. It must also be understood that statistics are only one side of the story and they can be understood when they are viewed as one measure involved in the analysis of the program. When statistics do not bear out the anticipated results, reasons

⁹Fantini, op. cit., pp.25-26.

may often be found in the external test conditions. All samples in the Norms Booklet for the MLA Tests, include from fifty to well over one hundred students and the sampling of 72 Campers in total was much smaller than any of these groups.

In the case of the Oaxtepec test program, many external test conditions seriously affected adversely the test results. The mechanical failures, noise interference, lack of physical alertness (after having travelled long distances by train or partied the night before), plus the unhappy attitude of Campers toward the test situation all seriously reduced the reliability of the scores. Add to this the very small sampling of scores at each level and the great variety of backgrounds of the tested population. The various amounts and kinds of language exposure made the Camp group unusually heterogeneous.

It is difficult to answer whether testing is entirely justified given the special character of the Summer Language Camp which promises the excitement of the foreign culture but retains some of the characteristics of a traditional program in school. There is no doubt that the Campers resented the time and inconvenience of the tests and naturally preferred to use that time for other more interesting pursuits in Mexico City. For EIL administration, the tests represent a considerable expense especially when the value of the returns is questionable.¹⁰

Under any circumstances, the Modern Language Aptitude Test is unnecessary. Its predictive ability holds no value for the Camp. Students have already been selected into the program on other grounds, and knowledge of their potential language ability serves no purpose. A diagnostic type test would serve greater purpose for placement as well as indicate

¹⁰Ibid., p. 33

areas in which teachers need to do specific work. Such a test would probably best be designed by the Camp administrators. It is doubtful that a standardized test could be very helpful in this respect.

Progress tests, too, need to be continued. Again these are teacher type tests which cost no money or time, and cause no inconvenience since there is no need to bus Campers to Mexico City, two hours away.

As for the MLA tests, the only real need is for the purpose of obtaining final scores of achievement to report to the high schools of the participants. If all three MLA tests are to be continued however, in spite of conditions which operate against their reliability, certain steps should be taken to reduce unfavorable external factors. Ideally, testing should be arranged nearby the Camp site. By all means, the Campers and their leaders must be well informed that testing is an integral part of the program. There should be strict agreement that Campers will be put to bed at a reasonable hour the night before an 8:30 A.M. exam. If these conditions cannot be met, then there are considerable reasons to fore-go the test.

The questionnaire, on the other hand, is a simple device which should be continued. Given at various times during the program, and again about one month after the program has concluded, it can provide valuable information for the Camp administrators. It readily reflects prevailing feelings of the participants. The last questionnaire-administered after return of the Campers to the United States-is possibly the most important one. It has been seen in the past that program participants are best able to evaluate the experience in retrospect. However, the combination of various evaluative devices surely provide the most reliable evidence of the program's total success.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS AT V
CAMPAMENTO DE OAXTEPEC, 1971

During the past three weeks you have been observed by me, your leaders, and Beatriz Fantini. You have been involved in intensive Spanish training in order to prepare you to live with Mexican families for the next three to four weeks. Now we would like to have your comments on your classes. Please make as many additional remarks as you feel necessary as we are all anxious to make the program as good as it can possibly be. At the end of your homestay we will ask you to fill out the questionnaire to see if any of your opinions change after your complete immersion in the Mexican culture.

I have finished--- seventh grade

_____ eighth grade

_____ ninth grade

_____ tenth grade

My previous language study consisted of _____ years in elementary school
_____ years in junior high, _____ years in high school, and/or _____
years speaking Spanish at home.

I entered into this language program with:

_____ high expectations

_____ moderate enthusiasm

_____ little enthusiasm

_____ only because it was required by the Experiment

_____ under influence of others who thought it a good idea

When I entered this program I thought the first three weeks would be:

_____ "camp-like"

_____ not as serious

_____ more intensive

Before entering the program I felt that the total progress we would make in three weeks would be:

_____ equivalent to six or eight weeks of language study in school

_____ equivalent to a semester or more

_____ adequate to enable me to converse in a limited way with my
host family and others in Mexico

Now that I have completed (or almost completed) the course, I feel that the progress I made was:

_____ equivalent to six or eight weeks of language study in school

_____ equivalent to a semester

_____ sufficient to give me a vocabulary of one or two hundred words
_____ equivalent to more than a semester
_____ adequate to enable me to converse in a limited way with my
host family and others in Mexico

In terms of the total number of hours spent in formal language study, I believe that the amount of time was:

_____ too little, we could have spent more time without suffering
_____ about the right amount
_____ too much, we simply could not absorb all we were given

In terms of the demands which the language made upon me, I felt that:

_____ other important aspects of Experiment orientation were slighted
_____ they did not seriously interfere with the orientation process
_____ orientation and language classes should not run at the same time
(State how they should be divided)

I feel that the three week language course was:

_____ extremely valuable to me (in preparation for my homestay
or in my homestay)
_____ a help, but not necessary
_____ unnecessary as I would learn the language anyway
_____ of no help

My homestay family (for later) spoke:

_____ no English
_____ some English
_____ - fluent English

In making my own evaluation of this program I believe that The Experiment Should: (check as many as are appropriate)

_____ shorten the program to two weeks
_____ lengthen the program to four weeks
_____ maintain the program for a three week duration
_____ add weekend homestays (in Cuernavaca or Cuautla)
_____ drop the program completely
_____ engage more qualified teachers
_____ require us to speak nothing but Spanish at all times

_____ have more correlated cultural activities to supplement language instruction (song feasts, films, etc.)

_____ keep us in our own Experiment groups rather than placing us into different level ability groupings

_____ place us into level ability groupings rather than by Experiment groups

Are you continuing the study of Spanish next fall

_____ yes

_____ no

Are you being given any academic credit for your study this summer?

_____ (if yes, explain)

_____ no

Please add any additional comments you feel are appropriate and which have not been covered adequately by the questions above. Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you all!

Susie

TABLE ONE

CATEGORIES FOR INTERACTION ANALYSIS

TEACHER TALK	INDIRECT INFLUENCE	<p>1.* <u>ACCEPTS FEELING</u>: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a non-threatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting or recalling feelings are included.</p> <p>2.* <u>PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES</u>: praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, but not at the expense of another individual; nodding head, or saying "um hm?" or "go on" are included.</p> <p>3.* <u>ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF STUDENTS</u>: clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a student. As teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five.</p> <p>4.* <u>ASKS QUESTIONS</u>: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer.</p>
	DIRECT INFLUENCE	<p>5.* <u>LECTURING</u>: giving facts or opinions about content or procedures; expressing his own ideas, asking rhetorical questions.</p> <p>6.* <u>GIVING DIRECTIONS</u>: directions, commands, or orders to which a student is expected to comply.</p> <p>7.* <u>CRITICIZING OR JUSTIFYING AUTHORITY</u>: statements intended to change student behavior from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing; extreme self-reference.</p>
STUDENT TALK		<p>8.* <u>STUDENT TALK-RESPONSE</u>: talk by students in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits student statement.</p> <p>9.* <u>STUDENT TALK-INITIATION</u>: talk by students which they initiate. If "calling on" student is only to indicate who may talk next, observer must decide whether student wanted to talk. If he did, use this category.</p>
		<p>10.* <u>SILENCE OR CONFUSION</u>: pauses, short periods of silence and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.</p>

*There is NO scale implied by these numbers. Each number is classificatory; it designates a particular kind of communication event. To write these numbers down during observation is to enumerate, not to judge a position on a scale.

Evaluation of Performance: Teacher Training

Teacher	Evaluator	Date	
	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Excellent Good Fair Poor </div>		Comments
I. The Classroom			
A. Appearance			
B. Physical (light, heat, etc.)			
II. The Lesson			
A. Clarity of objective			
B. Organization of material			
C. Appropriateness			
D. Logic (sequence)			
E. Pace			
F. Continuity			
III. The Teacher			
A. General impression			
1. Confidence			
2. Animation			
B. Voice (volume/tone)			
C. Command			
1. Eye contact			
D. Rapport			
E. Sensitivity			
F. Gestures			
IV. The Technique			
A. Oral model			Repetition Substitution Transformation Q-A etc.
B. Visual Aids			
C. Imagination (variety)			
D. Transitions			
E. Balance (teacher/student)			
F. Reinforcement			
G. Corrections			
V. The Class			
A. Participation			
B. Enthusiasm			
C. Discipline			
D. Learning			

REFERENCES

Educational Testing Service, Short-Cut Statistics for Teacher-Made Tests, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1960.

Fantini, Alvino, Oaxtepec: A Summer Language Camp for Children (Description and Evaluation), 1971.

Moscowitz, Gertrude, The Foreign Language Teacher Interacts, Association for Productive Teaching, Chicago, 1970.

Valette, Rebecca M., Modern Language Testing: A Handbook, Harcourt Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1967.